

INVOKING THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN PLANNING

CAROLYN WELLS

Doctor of Philosophy

2010

## **CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP & ORIGINALITY**

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Wells". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "J" and a long, sweeping underline.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge with sincere gratitude the assistance of my academic supervisors (in order of involvement) Dr Glen Searle for his commitment to the public interest and his confidence in the project, Dr Narelle Smith for her guidance in Q methodology, and especially Professor Spike Boydell who took over just in time to guide the writing process.

For their contributions of ideas and critical comments I thank the participants in the UTS DAB seminar series, especially the Wednesdays @ 5 series in 2007.

This research would not have been possible without the assistance of those who were prepared to share their views about the meaning of the public interest, including the student in the Master of Planning and the Master of Property courses 2007 and the industry leaders who participated in the online survey that generated the Q Method data. Special thanks also to the participants in the Delphi process who gave so generously of their insights and experience.

Several conferences audiences deserve special mention, including those at the 2006 Planning Institute of Australia NSW State Conference in Sydney; the 2007 Australasian Political Studies Association Conference in Melbourne; and in particular the audience at the 2008 Planning Institute of Australia National Congress, Sydney, who gave the research findings a memorable welcome.

I also wish to thank:

Chris Wheeler – NSW Deputy Ombudsman

Julie Conlon – NSW Department of Planning

John Roseth – Senior Commissioner, NSW Land & Environment Court

Norm Lenehan – Eurobodalla Shire Council

Members of interest groups associated with wind farming, urban density and maternity services.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Background to the research</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Research problem, issues and contribution</b>	<b>2</b>
1.2.1	Research problem	2
1.2.2	Theories and issues	4
1.2.3	Contribution of the thesis	6
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Justification for the research</b>	<b>7</b>
1.3.1	Continuing importance of the concept of the public interest	7
1.3.2	Poor practices associated with invoking the public interest	10
1.3.3	The need for an ideologically sensitive procedure	12
1.3.4	Research gaps	13
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>1.5</b>	<b>Outline of the thesis</b>	<b>16</b>
1.5.1	Outline of the thesis by chapter	16
1.5.2	Outline of the thesis by research issue	17
<b>1.6</b>	<b>Definitions</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>1.7</b>	<b>Delimitations of scope and key assumptions</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>1.8</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>THEORIES ABOUT THE PUBLIC INTEREST</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Unitary interest theories</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Common interest theories</b>	<b>30</b>
2.3.1	Provision and assessment of good reasons	32
2.3.2	Dialogical approaches	34
2.3.3	Rights-based approaches	35
2.3.4	Conclusions about common interest theories	37
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Group interest theories</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Individual interest theories</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>2.6</b>	<b>Approaches that include common and private interests</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>2.7</b>	<b>Conclusions from a planning perspective</b>	<b>46</b>

<b>3</b>	<b>RESEARCH ISSUES: PERSISTENT AMBIGUITIES ABOUT THE PUBLIC INTEREST</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Ambiguity #1: Is the public interest important?</b>	<b>50</b>
3.2.1	What the public interest theories say about this issue	50
3.2.2	Views of other planning theorists	53
3.2.3	Conclusion to section 3.2	54
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Ambiguity #2: Are there multiple public interests or is that an oxymoron?</b>	<b>54</b>
3.3.1	What the public interest theories say about this issue	54
3.3.2	Triple Bottom Line	55
3.3.3	Other examples of multiple common interests in competition	56
3.3.4	Conclusion to section 3.3	57
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Ambiguity #3: Can the public interest criteria be restricted?</b>	<b>58</b>
3.4.1	What the public interest theories say about this issue	58
3.4.2	Explanations of criteria restriction from organisation theory	59
3.4.3	Explanations of criteria restriction from collaborative planning theory	61
3.4.4	Conclusion to section 3.4	62
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Ambiguity #4: Whose interests matter – what is the relevant public?</b>	<b>63</b>
3.5.1	What the public interest theories say about this issue	63
3.5.2	Relevant public compared to stakeholder analysis	64
3.5.3	Spatial extent of the relevant public	65
3.5.4	Temporal extent of the relevant public	68
3.5.5	Conclusion to section 3.5	70
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Ambiguity #5: What is the status of private interests?</b>	<b>70</b>
3.6.1	What the public interest theories say about this issue	70
3.6.2	Inclusion of private interests in the public interest	71
3.6.3	Self interest, altruism and questions of motivation	72
3.6.4	Commons problems, restrictions and penalties	73
3.6.5	Conclusion to section 3.6	74
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Ambiguity #6: Who knows best - Which people and processes should be involved?</b>	<b>75</b>
3.7.1	What the public interest theories say about this issue	75
3.7.2	Theories of rationality and process choice	76
3.7.3	Other factors affecting the selection of people and processes	78
3.7.4	Conclusion to section 3.7	79
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Conclusion: Research issues</b>	<b>80</b>



<b>4</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY I: RESEARCHING AND ADDRESSING DIFFERING PERSPECTIVES</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Methods of researching differing perspectives</b>	<b>83</b>
4.2.1	Case studies	83
4.2.2	Practitioner interviews	84
4.2.3	Discourse analysis as a method of identifying different perspectives	85
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Approaches to overcoming differing perspectives</b>	<b>88</b>
4.3.1	Use of a <i>modus vivendi</i>	89
4.3.2	Discourse analysis as a method of identifying areas of agreement	90
4.3.3	Advantages of Q Method for this research	91
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Q methodology</b>	<b>93</b>
4.4.1	Participants	95
4.4.2	Stimulus material	95
4.4.3	Data collection	96
4.4.4	Discourse identification	97
4.4.5	Comparing and contrasting discourses	99
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Application of Q Method in this research</b>	<b>100</b>
4.5.1	Participants	100
4.5.2	Stimulus material	103
4.5.3	Data collection	104
4.5.4	Discourse identification	106
4.5.5	Comparing and contrasting discourses	107
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>DATA ANALYSIS I: IDENTIFYING DISCOURSES ABOUT THE PUBLIC INTEREST</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Student discourses</b>	<b>110</b>
5.2.1	Number of factors extracted	110
5.2.2	Student Discourse 1 – Balanced Approach	112
5.2.3	Student Discourse 2 – Market Orientation	114
5.2.4	Student Discourse 3 – Localism	116
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Leader discourses</b>	<b>118</b>
5.3.1	Number of factors extracted	118
5.3.2	Leader Discourse 1 – Environmentalism	119
5.3.3	Leader Discourse 2 – Executive perspective	121
5.3.4	Leader Discourse 3 – Anti-Authoritarianism	123
<b>5.5</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>125</b>

<b>6</b>	<b>DATA ANALYSIS II: WHAT THE DISCOURSES SAY ABOUT THE ISSUES</b>	<b>127</b>
6.1	Introduction	127
6.2	What the discourses say about the importance of the public interest	128
6.3	What the discourses say about the number of public interests	130
6.4	What the discourses say about the issue of limiting the criteria	133
6.5	What the discourses say about the extent of the relevant public	135
6.5.1	Spatial extent of the relevant public	135
6.5.2	Temporal extent of the relevant public	139
6.6	What the discourses say about the status of private interests	142
6.7	What the discourses say about people and processes	149
6.8	Conclusion	156
<b>7</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY II: DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF GUIDELINES</b>	<b>159</b>
7.1	Introduction	159
7.2	Methods for the development of the guidelines	159
7.2.1	The use of mixed methods	159
7.2.2	Challenges of R&D methodology	162
7.2.3	Application of R&D methodology	163
7.3	Methods for the evaluation of the guidelines/procedure?	164
7.3.1	Selection of the evaluation method	164
7.3.2	Delphi methodology	169
7.3.3	Application of the Delphi methodology in this research	171
7.4	Conclusion	175

<b>8</b>	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR INVOKING THE PUBLIC INTEREST</b>	<b>177</b>
<b>8.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>177</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<b>Guidelines relating to the importance of the public interest</b>	<b>180</b>
8.2.1	The links between the public interest and corrupt conduct	181
8.2.2	Conclusion about the importance of the public interest	183
<b>8.3</b>	<b>Guidelines relating to the number of public interests</b>	<b>184</b>
8.3.1	Language for recognising multiple public interests	184
8.3.2	Balancing tests	188
8.3.3	Conclusion about the number of public interests	198
<b>8.4</b>	<b>Guidelines relating to restricting criteria</b>	<b>198</b>
8.4.1	The statutory position in NSW	199
8.4.2	Examples of restricted criteria in public interest tests	200
8.4.3	Conclusion about the issue of restricted criteria	202
<b>8.5</b>	<b>Guidelines relating to identifying the relevant public</b>	<b>203</b>
8.5.1	Techniques for identifying the spatial extent of the relevant public	204
8.5.2	Techniques for including the needs of future generations	206
8.5.3	Conclusion about the context of a public interest determination	208
<b>8.6</b>	<b>Guidelines relating to the status of private interests</b>	<b>209</b>
8.6.1	The need for a criterion for including private interests	210
8.6.2	Three contenders and a winner	210
<b>8.7</b>	<b>Guidelines relating to the people and processes involved</b>	<b>214</b>
8.7.1	Issues identification stage	216
8.7.2	Decision making stage	217
8.7.3	Categorisation of public and private benefits and detriments	218
8.4.2	Application of the Wood-Robinson test	220
8.7.5	Assigning importance to benefits and detriments	222
8.7.6	Assessment of net effect	226
8.7.7	Identification of best option and trade-offs.	227
<b>8.8</b>	<b>Conclusion: the operational meaning of the public interest</b>	<b>231</b>



<b>9</b>	<b>EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROCEDURE</b>	<b>234</b>
<b>9.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>234</b>
<b>9.2</b>	<b>Definition of the public interest (Thread A)</b>	<b>237</b>
<b>9.3</b>	<b>Dealing with multiple public interests: the balancing test (Threads G, H, I and J)</b>	<b>239</b>
9.3.1	Balancing of benefits and detriments	239
9.3.2	Classifying impacts as benefits or detriments (Thread I)	240
9.3.3	The method of weighing benefits and detriments – qualitative description of importance (Thread G)	241
9.3.4	Reaching a conclusion and breaking tied results (Threads H & J)	242
<b>9.4</b>	<b>Restricting the public interest criteria (Thread C)</b>	<b>244</b>
<b>9.5</b>	<b>Identifying the relevant public</b>	<b>246</b>
<b>9.6</b>	<b>Distinguishing between private and public (Threads D, E &amp; F)</b>	<b>248</b>
<b>9.7</b>	<b>People and processes involved in determining the public interest (Thread B)</b>	<b>252</b>
<b>9.8</b>	<b>Conclusion: Overall opinion of the procedure (Thread K)</b>	<b>258</b>
<b>9.9</b>	<b>Final version of the guidelines for invoking the public interest</b>	<b>261</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>274</b>
<b>10.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>274</b>
<b>10.2</b>	<b>Conclusions about the research issues</b>	<b>276</b>
10.2.1	Introduction	276
10.2.2	Importance of the public interest	277
10.2.3	Multiple public interests	278
10.2.4	Practice of restricting criteria	280
10.2.5	Relevant public	282
10.2.6	Status of private interests	283
10.2.7	People and processes involved in determining the public interest	284
<b>10.3</b>	<b>Conclusions about the research problem</b>	<b>285</b>
<b>10.4</b>	<b>Implications for theory</b>	<b>290</b>
<b>10.5</b>	<b>Implications for policy and practice</b>	<b>292</b>
<b>10.6</b>	<b>Limitations of the research</b>	<b>292</b>
<b>10.7</b>	<b>Implications for methodology</b>	<b>294</b>
10.7.1	Q Method	294
10.7.2	Delphi process	395
<b>10.8</b>	<b>Implications for further research</b>	<b>296</b>
<b>10.9</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>297</b>

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**298**

## **APPENDICES**

<b>1</b>	<b>Management of ethical issues in this research</b>	<b>314</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Q Method Data collection instruments</b>	<b>317</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Relevance of statements to the research issues</b>	<b>353</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Distinguishing statements for Student Factor 1</b>	<b>363</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Distinguishing statements for Student Factor 2</b>	<b>366</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Distinguishing statements for Student Factor 3</b>	<b>370</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Distinguishing statements for Leader Factor 1</b>	<b>373</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Distinguishing statements for Leader Factor 2</b>	<b>375</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Distinguishing statements for Leader Factor 3</b>	<b>377</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Z scores for all statements for all discourses</b>	<b>379</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Examples of public interest tests</b>	<b>394</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Summary of data from early trials of the guidelines</b>	<b>404</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Preliminary reading for the Delphi process participants</b>	<b>415</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Survey instruments sent to the Delphi process participants</b>	<b>428</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>Results of the Delphi process</b>	<b>449</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>Glossary</b>	<b>478</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Comparison of stakeholder analysis and the identification of the relevant public	66
Table 4.1	Comparison of possible research methods for identifying different perspectives	92
Table 4.2	Number of student and leader participants in the Q Method research by role with respect to planning	102
Table 5.1	Statistical data on the rotation of student factors	111
Table 5.2	Most salient distinguishing statements for Student Factor 1 (Balanced Approach)	113
Table 5.3	Most salient distinguishing statements for Student Factor 2 (Market Orientation)	115
Table 5.4	Most salient distinguishing statements for Student Factor 3 (Localism)	117
Table 5.5	Statistical data on the rotation of leader factors	118
Table 5.6	Most salient distinguishing statements for Leader Factor 1 (Environmentalism)	120
Table 5.7	Most salient distinguishing statements for Leader Factor 2 (Executive Perspective)	122
Table 5.8	Most salient distinguishing statements for Leader Factor 3 (Anti-Authoritarianism)	124
Table 6.1	Statements relating to the importance of the public interest and the associated z scores of each discourse	129
Table 6.2	Statements relating to the problem of one or many public interests, and the associated z scores of each discourse	131
Table 6.3	Statements relating to the problem of limited public interest criteria, and the associated z scores of each discourse	134
Table 6.4	Statements relating to the problem of defining the spatial dimensions of the 'relevant public', and the associated z scores of each discourse	136-7
Table 6.5	Statements relating to the problem of defining the temporal dimensions of the 'relevant public', and the associated z scores of each discourse	141
Table 6.6	Statements relating to the problem of private interests and collective interests, and the associated z scores of each discourse	143-4

Table 6.7	Statements relating to the problem of selecting processes and participants, and the associated z scores of each discourse	152-4
Table 7.1	Comparison of possible research methods	168
Table 7.2	Participants in the Delphi process	173
Table 8.1	Features of relevant public interest tests	193-195
Table 8.2	Comparison of criteria for judging whether a private interest is warrants inclusion in a determination of the public interest	212
Table 8.3	Determination of the public interest with respect to locating the South Coast Correctional Centre at Nowra	230
Table 8.4	Proposed guidelines for determining the public interest and their basis in areas of discourse agreement, planning practice and/or foundational guidelines	232-3
Table 9.1	Structure of the Delphi process, showing how the threads (rows) were discussed over the rounds (columns)	235
Table 10.1	Comparison of the Public Interest Test proposed in this research with other tests found in Planning	289
Appendix 3	Table showing relevance of each statement to the research issues	353-362
Appendix 4	Table showing z scores for statements that distinguish student factor 1 from student factors 2 and 3	363-364
Appendix 5	Table showing z scores for statements that distinguish student factor 2 from student factors 1 and 3	366-379
Appendix 6:	Table showing z scores for statements that distinguish student factor 3 from student factors 1 and 2	370-372
Appendix 7	Table showing z scores for statements that distinguish leader factor 1 from leader factors 2 and 3	373-374
Appendix 8	Table showing z scores for statements that distinguish leader factor 2 from leader factors 1 and 3	375-376
Appendix 9	Table showing z scores for statements that distinguish leader factor 3 from leader factors 1 and 2	377-378
Appendix 10	Table showing z scores for all statements for all discourses	379-393
Appendix 13	Table within the Preliminary Reading for the Delphi process participants, showing the proposed procedure with hypothetical example	418-427



Appendix 15 Table 1	Responses to Round 2 Question 4	457
Appendix 15 Table 2	Responses to Round 2 Question 5	460
Appendix 15 Table 3	Responses to Round 4 Question 1	468
Appendix 15 Table 4	Responses to Round 4 Question 2	470
Appendix 15 Table 5	Responses to Round 4 Question 3	472
Appendix 15 Table 6	Responses to Round 4 Question 4	473
Appendix 15 Table 7	Responses to Round 4 Question 5	474
Appendix 15 Table 8	Responses to Round 4 Question 6	476

#### **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 8.1	Cartoon showing the popular view of the current NSW government with respect to urban planning	181
Figure 9.1	The public interest determination cycle and the associated information flows between stages	255



## ABSTRACT

The value to planning of the concept of the public interest is in question due to its lack of an agreed operational meaning (Campbell and Marshall 2002, Moroni 2006). This research identifies those aspects of the concept that are agreed on by discourses about the concept of the public interest found within the planning and property development sphere in New South Wales, Australia. It then identifies practices relevant to determining the public interest that are compatible with those areas of agreement and finally proposes and evaluates procedures for determining the substantive content of the public interest in any specific context.

Different research methods are employed at different stages of the research. The discourses are identified using Q Method, where practitioners rate statements about the concept of the public interest and a form of factor analysis is applied to those ratings. The ratings are also used to identify areas of agreement among the discourses. The proposed procedures are evaluated and refined using a Delphi process to structure discussion among practitioners who are experienced in determining the substance of the public interest.

By minimising reliance on contentious issues in the proposed procedures, emphasis can move away from procedural arguments to the important work of exploring the substance of the public interest. That is, the procedures act as a *modus vivendi*, a practical arrangement between those whose views differ, which by-passes areas of difficulty for the sake of a contingency (in this case, progressing their claims about the public interest, and more broadly, developing collective understanding what serves the public interest).

The proposed procedures are outcomes-focused (consequentialist) but deal with the weaknesses of traditional utilitarian approaches by including common interests as well as individual interests, using qualitative evaluation processes that address the problems of value incommensurability, and allowing for the consideration of distributional effects. The procedures also allow for the inclusions of private interests where it is in the public interest to do so (the Wood-Robinson principle), thus ensuring that individual rights are taken into account.